

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This letter is responsive to the Office Action dated March 25, 2008. This response is accompanied by a request for one-month extension of time. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this response is timely filed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted in the first paragraph of the detailed action that correction to paragraphs 5, 13 and 21 of the specification was required. By this Response, the applicant has amended the paragraphs as requested by the Examiner. In addition, the applicant has corrected a typographical error in paragraph 15 as well as inserted reference numeral 100 in paragraph 31.

In paragraph 2 of the detailed action, the Examiner objected to the drawings. The drawings were objected to as the biological cartridge was not shown. By this Response, the applicant has submitted an amended figure 2 in which cartridge 100 is shown. As set out in these remarks, paragraph 31 of the speciation was amended to insert reference numeral 100.

In the Office Action, the Examiner advised that should claim 2 be found allowable, claim 3 would be objected too for double patenting. By this Response, the applicant has cancelled claim 3 without prejudice.

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to some of the language in claims 5 and 6. By this Response, the applicant has amended claims 5 and 6 to address the typographical errors raised by the Examiner.

The Examiner rejected claims 7 and 8 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and deistically claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner stated that these claims "seem to mis-describe the invention". The applicant refers the Examiner to paragraph 23 of the specification (i.e. the paragraph beginning at page 5, line 14). In that paragraph it states as following:

"Accordingly, a closure member, such as valve 40, may be associated with at least the inlet 30 or outlet 32 which is provided in bottom 24 of each container 20..."

Accordingly, as stated in the specification, the closure member, such as a valve, may be associated with at least the inlet 30. Alternately, the valve may be associated with at least the outlet 32. The use of the word "or" indicates that valve 40 need only be associated one of the inlet or the outlet. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 7 as on file when the Office Action was issued was in compliance with 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

By the Response, the applicant has amended claim 1 to include therein a statement that each of the containers that is removable has a water outlet port sealing member. The text of this limitation is derived from former claim 7. A suitable amendment has been made to claim 7 to avoid duplicative matter. The applicant notes that, as described in the application, a plurality of containers, each of which contain sand and at least one of the containers being removable, is utilized in a water treatment apparatus. Each of the removable containers, as set out in amended claim 1, has a water outlet port sealing member associated with the removable container. The applicant has carefully considered the prior art rejections raised by the Examiner and noted that claim 7 has not been rejected in view of any of the prior art references. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that, based upon the art of record, claim 1, which incorporates material from claim 7, is allowable.

In view of the foregoing, favourable consideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BERESKIN & PARR

By 
Philip C. Mendes da Costa
Reg. No. 33,106
Tel: 416-957-1695